UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/632,959	08/04/2000	Sanjay M. Parekh	04159.0001U2	1066

23859 7590 07/09/2009

Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll, LLP
SUITE 1000
999 PEACHTREE STREET
ATLANTA, GA 30309-3915

EXAMINER	
TRUONG, LAN DAI T	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2452	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/09/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/632,959	PAREKH, SANJAY M.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	LAN-DAI Thi TRUONG	2452	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *03* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *09 March 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,6 and 13-18* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,6 and 13-18* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *06/11/09; 03/16/09*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is response to communications: application filed on 08/04/2000; amendment filed on 03/9/2009. Claims 1-2, 6 and 13-18 are pending; claims 3-5 and 7-12 are canceled.

2. Applicant's arguments filed on 03/9/2009 have been fully considered. But Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. The previous Office Action is retained.

Response to arguments

3. Regarding applicant's arguments to claims 1 and 13 with respect to combination of Gupta, Johnson and Dupray does not teach claimed subject matters of "receiving by an external server on external network a request for information from an Internet user through a proxy server; determining by the external server that the request for information is through the proxy server; and redirecting by the external server the request for information to an internal server of a private network" are not persuasive. Those claimed subject matters are taught by Johnson. Mainly, Johnson teaches that a router outside firewall (router 16) receives service request message transmitted through a firewall (18) from a browser (14) and the router behind the firewall (router 10) (see Johnson, figure 1, items 14, 16, 18, 20; column 5, lines 62-63; column 2, lines 23-25; column 4, lines 56-67) (where, "the router outside a firewall" reads on 'an external server' as claimed; "the router behind the firewall" reads on 'internal server' as claimed; "a firewall" reads on 'proxy' as claimed). Further, Johnson teaches that the router enables to identify if any other preferred router for serving the request, if so, then the router will redirect the received request to the preferred router (see Johnson, column 3, lines 15-16; column 5 lines 18-25, 50-60). Also, The Johnson' s external router is capable to recognize if a request comes

through a firewall in order to decide to redirect the request to the internal router, see (column 6, lines 8-21, 46-65). Therefore, the Johnson's ideas reads on claimed subject matters of "receiving by an external server on external network a request for information from an Internet user through a proxy server; determining by the external server that the request for information is through the proxy server; and redirecting by the external server the request for information to an internal server of a private network."

4. Regarding applicant's arguments with respect to the cited references do not teach "three separate entities- a proxy server, an external server and an internal server" are not persuasive; At first, in claims 1 and 13, applicant does not clearly definite that a proxy server, external server and internal server are separated. However, Johnson clearly discloses a network including 3 separated network elements (i.e. "the router outside a firewall" reads on 'an external server' as claimed; "the router behind the firewall" reads on 'internal server' as claimed; "a firewall" reads on 'proxy' as claimed).

5. In response to applicant's arguments with respect to that the examiner has the burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness; The examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, it would have been obvious to combine Johnson's ideas of determining if the service request is sent through a proxy/ firewall, and then determining if there is any preferred router which can provide service to the service

request, so that the service request will be redirect to that preferred router and Dupray's ideas of determining and selecting location for target mobile station based at least in part on confidence levels into Gupta-Johnson's system in order to provide an efficient communication network (i.e. void overloading network traffic (see, Johnson, column 2, lines 1-2) ; rapidly allocate location of target device; decreasing location determining difficulties due to multiple result locations by implying confidence levels (see Dupray, column 8, lines 40-67)).

Claim Objections

6. Claim 18 is objected to because of the following informalities: depending on canceled claim 3. Appropriate correction is required. For examination purpose, the Office assumes claim 18 depends on claim 1.

Claim rejections-35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2, 6 and 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being un-patentable over Gupta et al. (U.S. 2001/0020242) in view of Johnson et al. (U.S. 6,505,254) further in view of Dupray et al. (U.S. 7,298,327).

Regarding claim 1:

Gupta discloses the invention substantially as claimed, including a method, which can be implemented in a computer hardware or software code for obtaining a geographic location of an

Internet user that accesses an external network from a private network through a proxy server, comprising:

receiving by an external server on an external network a request for information from an Internet user through a proxy server: ("a third party ISP/or the ISP" (which reads on 'the external network' as claimed) receives a user roaming request through a proxy: Gupta, [0060]).

redirecting by the external server the request for information to an internal server of a private network: (the ISP then forwards the user roaming request to the user's home ISP (which reads on 'an internal server' as claimed) for user profile information including (resident/ email address, age, name...etc): Gupta, [0060]; [0053]; [0033]).

the internal server determining the geographic location of the Internet user; receiving by the external server the geographic location of the Internet user from the internal server within the private network: (the ISP (which reads on external server as claimed) then obtains user profile information that includes "resident/ address…etc" (those read on geographic location as claimed) from the user's home ISP: Gupta, [0060], lines 5-9).

using the geographic location of the Internet user in handling the request for information received from the Internet user: (the ISP uses the received user profile information for inserting advertisements: Gupta, [0060], lines 5-9).

However, Gupta does not explicitly disclose determining the request is through the proxy server by the external server.

In analogous art, Johnson teaches interactive communications between an external router and an internal router through a proxy/firewall. The Johnson' s external router is capable to

recognize if a request comes through a firewall in order to decide to redirect the request to internal router, see (column 6, lines 8-21, 46-65).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Johnson's ideas of determining if the request came through a proxy into Gupta's system in order to increase secure communication network (i.e. ability to catch all messages those are sent/come from outside network/ external network 17-21), see (Johnson, column 6, lines).

However, Gupta-Johnson does not explicitly disclose selecting the geographic location of the Internet user from one or more determined geographic locations based at least in part on a confidence level associated with respective determined geographic locations.

Dupray discloses method of determining and selecting location for target mobile station based at least in part on confidence level, see (Dupray, column 14, lines 20-46).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Dupray's ideas of determining and selecting location for target mobile station based at least in part on confidence levels into Gupta-Johnson's system in order to provide an efficient geographic allocation system (e.g. rapidly allocate location of target device; decreasing location determining difficulties due to multiple result locations by implying confidence levels), see (Dupray, column 8, lines 40-67).

Regarding claim 13:

Gupta discloses the invention substantially as claimed, including a method, which can be implemented in a computer hardware or software code for an external server to obtaining a

geographic location of user that accesses an external from an internal network through a proxy server, comprising:

receiving by an external server on an external network a request for information from a user through a proxy server: (In Gupta communication network, "a third party ISP/or the ISP" (which reads on 'the external network' as claimed) receives a user roaming request through a proxy: [0060]).

redirecting by the external server the request for information to an internal server of the internal network: (Gupta teaches the ISP (which reads on 'the external server' as claimed) then forwards user request to the user's home ISP (which reads on 'an internal server' as claimed) for user profile information i.e. resident/ address, age, name...etc: [0060]; [0053]; [0033]).

determining by the internal server an internal network address of the user; sending the geographic location to the external server on the external network: (user profile information (e.g. email address) are determined by the user's home ISP: Gupta, [0060], lines 5-9; [0058]).

storing the geographic location of the user and the internal network address of the user in a geographic location/internal network address mapping table such that to determine the geographic location of the user can later be determined based on the internal network address of the user by accessing the geographic location/internal network address mapping table: (a database stores information indicating associations between user's IP addresses and user's phone numbers. The database can be later searched based upon IP address to determine user phone numbers those are used to determine user geographical locations through area codes: Gupta, [0030]).

determining a geographic location of the user: (the database, storing information indicating associations between user's IP addresses and user's phone number, can be later searched to determine user phone numbers those are used to determine user geographical locations through area codes: Gupta, [0030]).

However, Gupta does not explicitly disclose determining the request is through the proxy server by the external server.

In analogous art, Johnson teaches interactive communications between an external router and an internal router through a proxy/firewall. The Johnson' s external router is capable to recognize if a request comes through a firewall in order to decide to redirect the request to internal router, see (column 6, lines 8-21, 46-65).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Johnson's ideas of determining if the request came through a proxy into Gupta's system in order to increase secure communication network (i.e. ability to catch all messages those are sent/come from outside network/ external network 17-21), see (Johnson, column 6, lines).

However, Gupta-Johnson does not explicitly disclose selecting the geographic location of the user from one or more determined geographic locations based at least in part on a confidence level associated with respective determined geographic locations.

Dupray discloses method of determining and selecting location for target mobile station based at least in part on confidence levels, see (Dupray, column 14, lines 20-46).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Dupray's ideas of determining and selecting location for target

mobile station based at least in part on confidence levels into Gupta-Johnson's system in order to provide an efficient geographic allocation system (e.g. rapidly allocate location of target device; decreasing location determining difficulties due to multiple result locations by implying confidence levels), see (Dupray, column 8, lines 40-67).

Regarding claim 6:

In addition to rejection in claim 1, Gupta-Johnson-Dupray further discloses determining an internal address of the Internet user: (user profile information (e.g. email address) is determined by the user's home ISP: Gupta, [0060], lines 5-9; [0058]).

storing the geographic location of the Internet user mapped to the internal address of the Internet user in a geographic location/internal IP address mapping table contained within the private network; and accessing a the geographic location/internal IP address mapping table contained within the private network, in order to later determine the geographic location of the Internet user based on the internal address of the Internet user: (a database stores information indicating associations between user's IP addresses and user's phone numbers. The database can be later searched based upon IP address to determine user phone numbers those are used to determine user geographical locations through area codes: Gupta, [0030]).

Regarding claim 2:

In addition to rejection in claim 1, Gupta-Johnson-Dupray further discloses wherein the external is Internet: (Gupta: figure 2, item 224; [0044]-[0045]).

Regarding claim 17:

In addition to rejection in claim 1, Gupta-Johnson-Dupray further discloses the user is one of a plurality of users on the private network that accesses the external network using a first

external address of proxy server: (Gupta discloses a proxy server/firewall implements as an intermediary agent to provide security for communications between a private network and an external network. As one of ordinary skill in the art would know that the external address of proxy server should be used during communications through the private network and the external network: [0018]).

Regarding claim 14:

In addition to rejection in claim 13, Gupta-Johnson-Dupray further discloses external network and internal network both are IP network: (Gupta: [0033]; [0053]-[0055]).

Regarding claim 15:

In addition to rejection in claim 13, Gupta-Johnson-Dupray further discloses using a computer on the external network the geographic location of user in processing the request for information: (Gupta discloses using external ISP uses received user profile information including address/ or resident to insert advertisements: [0060]).

Regarding claim 16:

In addition to rejection in claim 13, Gupta-Johnson-Dupray further discloses the user is one of a plurality of users on the internal network that accesses the external network using a first external address of proxy server: (Gupta discloses a proxy server/firewall used as an intermediary agent to provide security of communications between a private network and an external network. As one of ordinary skill in the art would know that the external address of proxy server should be used during communications through the private network and the external network: [0018]).

Regarding claim 18:

In addition to rejection in claim 1, Gupta- Johnson -Dupray further discloses the user is one of a plurality of users on the private network that accesses the external network using a first external address of proxy server: (Gupta discloses a proxy server/firewall used as an intermediary agent to provide security of communications between a private network and an external network. The external address of proxy server should be included in communication message header during communications passing through the private network and the external network: ([0018]).

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusions

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LAN-DAI Thi TRUONG whose telephone number is (571)272-7959. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday from 8:30am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A. Follansbee can be reached on 571-272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

07/02/2009.
Ldt.

/Kenny S Lin/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2452